

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, February 7, 1992

The House met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. LAUGHLIN].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 7, 1992.

I hereby designate the Honorable GREG LAUGHLIN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

In our headlong rush to seize the moment and to make our mark, we reflect this day, O God, not on our tasks, but on the contributions of those people who have gone before us and have shown the way. For those who have graced these Halls and shown the way of peace and justice, we offer our thanks; for those who have spoken to us the words of wisdom and guided toward the light of truth, we offer our praise; and for all those who have had great responsibility and difficult decisions, we express our appreciation. May we, each one, reflect on the gifts of those before us, and inspired by their commitment, may we go about our labors with a sense of humility and renewed dedication. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announced to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized to lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GOSS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

SYMPATHY AND PRAYERS FOR ALL KILLED IN AIRPLANE CRASH IN EVANSVILLE, IN

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, a terrible tragedy occurred back home in Kentucky and across the river in Indiana yesterday when a C-130B Hercules military transport on a training flight from the 123d Tactical Airlift Wing, which is stationed at Standiford Field in my district, crashed into a motel-hotel restaurant complex which is in the district of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY]. It killed all five members of the crew, all of whom were from the Louisville area. It killed, unfortunately, 11 people on the ground and injured many more.

It is a terrible tragedy. Words that we and the Kentucky delegation, which is on the floor today, who will speak, will do very little to assuage the human toil and tragedy, but we do want to join and extend on our behalf and on behalf of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY] and the Indiana delegation our condolences to the families and loved ones of the deceased.

The five members of the crew, all of whom were killed and were from the Louisville area, were: Maj. Richard A. Strang, 39, of Floyds Knobs, IN; Capt. Warren Klingaman, 26, of Louisville; Lt. Vincent D. Yancar, 25, of Louisville; M. Sgt. William Hawkins, 41, of Crestwood, KY; and M. Sgt. John H. Medley, 38, of Louisville.

Once again we extend, Mr. Speaker, our condolences to all the families and loved ones of these brave people.

SYMPATHY AND CONDOLENCES TO VICTIMS OF TRAGEDY IN EVANSVILLE, IN

(Mr. BUNNING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague from the Third District and also from the First District in expressing my deep condolences to those members of the Air National Guard and all others who have had a tragedy occur in Evansville, IN, on the crash of the Kentucky Air National Guard plane today.

No one can explain those things away. No one can explain why things like that happen. That was a routine training flight that had gone on many, many times before.

It is just that everybody in Kentucky and Indiana and around this country want to express our deep sympathy for those people who died in the service of their country.

TRIBUTE TO CLEO N. APPERSON

(Mr. HUBBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues from Kentucky in expressing my heartfelt sympathy to the families of the victims of yesterday's tragic military plane crash near Dress Regional Airport in Evansville, IN.

This tragedy occurred just across the Ohio River from my congressional district.

The plane was a Kentucky Air National Guard transport plane on a training mission. For 6 years, I was a member of the Kentucky Air National Guard and thus this tragedy has a special meaning to me.

I also take this opportunity to pay tribute to a longtime friend, Cleo N. Apperson of Mayfield, KY, who died at age 87 yesterday at this home.

Cleo Apperson was city clerk for my hometown of Mayfield, KY, for 26 years. He had such a good personality and was so friendly people in my hometown didn't even complain as they paid their city taxes.

Cleo Apperson was an elder of Mayfield's First Christian Church and a member of the local Masonic Lodge. Truly those of us who had the pleasure and privilege of knowing Cleo Apperson realize that this was a wonderful man. He will be greatly missed.

Among the survivors of this dear friend of mine are his lovely and talented wife, Mary Kate Kennedy Apperson, who for 22 years was our Graves County deputy circuit court clerk at Mayfield; three children—Dr. William Apperson, pastor of the First Christian Church of Meridian, MS; Barbara St. Aubin, a civic and church leader in Bethesda, MD; and Walter Lee Apperson, for many years the editor of the Mayfield Messenger and now the publisher of the Murray, KY, Ledger and Times; a sister, Evelyn Ellington of Temple, TX; nine grandchildren and six great-grandchildren.

My wife Carol and I extend to the Apperson family our sympathy.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

DEMOCRATS SHOULD JOIN IN PASSING THE REPUBLICAN GROWTH PACKAGE

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, since we only have 42 days left until March 20, it is a real treat to hear the leaders over there on the Democratic side of the aisle starting to talk like they were Republicans at heart.

All of a sudden they all want to cut the terrible burden of taxes that lies so heavy on the shoulders of middle-class America.

It would be wonderful if it were true, Mr. Speaker. But the election year conversion among the big spending liberals is mighty suspicious. In 42 days we will find out.

If I recall correctly, many of these folks who are now telling us how dearly they love the middle-class taxpayer and how they would love to cut taxes are the very same people who voted for the largest tax increase in our Nation's history just a year ago.

It is unfortunate that it took a terrible recession to convince the Democrats in this body that Americans are taxed too much.

And I just hope they have learned enough to join us—in 42 days—by passing the Republican growth package of tax incentives to encourage long lasting, long-term growth.

BRING AMERICAN TAX DOLLARS BACK HOME

(Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, last year during the defense authorization bill, I offered an amendment which is now law in this country. It established an account in the Department of Defense into which money would be received resulting from negotiations between our President and this administration and other countries for whom we now spend defense dollars.

For example, we spend American tax dollars to defend Japan. We spend American tax dollars to defend Germany, to defend France. We borrow money from them, increase our deficit, and spend money for the defense of other countries.

It is time to tell those countries the free ride is over. Uncle Sam cannot afford it anymore. You have to start paying for your own defense or at least reimbursing us for what we spend.

The President signed that defense authorization bill with my amendment in it and said:

I intend to treat this as a recommendation, rather than a requirement.

We have written the President this week saying that is unacceptable.

The President has a responsibility to stop having the American taxpayer pay for everybody else's defense. The President and Secretary Baker did a good job in dealing with burden sharing in the Gulf war. The President had Secretary Baker shuttling around the Middle East. He collected enormous amounts of commitments and some money coming in to help defray the cost of that war.

We expect this administration to have the will and the interest to do exactly the same thing on a year-to-year basis with Japan, with Germany, with France, and others, to begin relieving the American taxpayer of the tens of billions of dollars that we now spend to defend other countries who can well afford to defend themselves or who can well afford to reimburse us for the money we are spending for that purpose. We do not intend to let the President ignore the law that we passed last year. We have sent him a letter with the majority leadership on the letter saying:

Mr. President, we expect you to pay attention to this law and to comply with it.

□ 1110

BLUEPRINT FOR ECONOMIC DISASTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to spend a few minutes addressing my colleagues and the folks listening on the subject of the President's 1992 budget.

This is the 1992 budget the President sent to the U.S. Congress. It is about 10 pounds, about 1,500 pages. It is full of a lot of words, charts, graphs, statistics, data, and I wanted to talk a little about how this relates to this country's future.

Mr. Speaker, this country is going through some awfully tough times. People are wringing their hands wondering about the future, wondering when this recession will end, wondering what caused it, and what could be done to fix it.

As we have seen just this morning, we have a political environment in which there is not only a Presidential campaign going on, but a Congress conducting business as usual.

We have got folks saying, "Oh, it's the liberals' fault," "It's the Democrats' fault," "It's the Republicans' fault." The fact is this country is suffering some very serious economic distress, and the question before us is: What do we do to confront it? What do we do to deal with it?

Now let me start at the outset to say that I think it is everybody's fault. I know that is easy to say, but I really believe we have had terrible leadership,

terrible leadership from the White House, for a good long while, and we have had a Congress unable to find its own way. Congress usually responds to good leadership. When we have had no leadership or terrible leadership, this place will be circling around.

Mr. Speaker, the President proposes very large deficits, and he proposes the field of play in his budget, and then Congress is content to quibble about yardlines while the fact is: Everybody is at fault with where we find ourselves, and everybody's responsibility, it seems to me, from the White House to both sides of the aisle here in Congress, is to find a way to join hands and do what is necessary to solve the problems we face.

Now I wanted to talk a little about the President's budget, and then I want to talk about the positive things we have to do to try and set this place right. First, the President's budget:

I want to demonstrate why we are not getting any leadership. Page 25 of the President's budget is the page that describes, after some verbiage and his budget, outlays, revenues and deficits. The President stood at the microphone behind me a couple of weeks ago, and, as has always been the case with Presidents, they come down here, and they say, "You know, the villain is the Federal deficit. We've got to deal with this Federal deficit. It is crippling this country," they say, "and, Congress, get responsible. Start doing something about the Federal deficit."

Well, it is one thing to say it from the microphone behind me in a Presidential address. It is quite another thing to send a plan down to Congress, and let me read the President's plan for deficits. The President says in his 1992 budget book, "Congress, I want you to enact deficits in this budget. If you enact everything that I recommend," now speaking as Mr. Bush, "if you, Congress, enact everything I recommend, here's what I want from you: I want you to enact budget deficits equaling \$2.21 trillion in added debt for this country this year and in the 5 succeeding years."

Mr. Speaker, people say, "How can that be? Mr. Bush is a conservative. He surely wouldn't propose that."

Page 25 is available to all Americans, and let me just give my colleagues the first year. It is the year we are in. The President says, "This year our budget deficit," with all of his proposals, "will be \$399 billion." But in order to get to only a \$399 billion deficit, which itself is a disaster—the largest deficit in the history of America, probably in the history of the world—he had to add in the Social Security surplus that we are accruing this year, which will be \$74 billion this year. In other words, \$74 billion more will be collected in the Social Security account this year than we need to spend out in Social Security. Why? Because when the folks who are

the baby boomers retire at the end of this century and at the start of the next century, around 2010, 2015, we know we are going to have trouble in Social Security because then we will have the fewest number of workers supporting the largest number of retired people, and that will create maximum financial strain.

So, in 1983 we did one of the few responsible things in a long while. We said, "We're going to save for the future. We're going to start building up some money so we have it when we have that strain on the Social Security system." This year there will be a \$74-billion buildup, receipts over expenditures.

Now the President says, "I'm going to take that \$74 billion, and I'm going to subtract it from the budget deficit to show you a lower deficit." That means they misuse the Social Security money. That money comes from paychecks of American workers and from businesses, goes into a trust fund and can only be used for Social Security, except on this page, in the President's budget, it is used to reduce the Federal deficit.

THE REAL DEFICIT

Mr. Speaker, the President says the Federal deficit is \$399 billion this year. But the \$74 billion in Social Security surplus cannot honestly be used to reduce the deficit. So, put that aside, as it must be, and the real budget deficit, the honest deficit this year, the real operating budget deficit, is \$473 billion this year. It is a shameful, reckless, and dangerous fiscal policy that is going to break this country.

Now, add up 5 years beyond this year, and we get a proposed budget from a conservative President that says: "I want the Congress to adopt my plan, and my plan says, 'Let's add \$2.21 trillion to the Federal debt.'" That is not a plan. That is a blueprint for economic disaster for this country.

Mr. Speaker, this country already has a \$3.6 trillion debt load, and the President says, "Let's add to that to the tune of a billion dollars a day, every day, 7 days a week, every week, every month, for 6 years, spending a billion dollars a day that we don't have." That is not a fiscal policy that is going to put this country back on track.

And that anticipates the President getting everything he wants. If we do everything the President suggests, we end up with \$2.21 trillion in additional debt in this country.

Well, what should we do? Clearly I am not very impressed with this budget. This is not leadership. This is a document from an administration that is waving the white flag of surrender on economic policy. It is an administration that is saying, "I give up on deficits. We're going to lead in the wrong direction."

And I have said Congress is not much better. This body is not without fault.

□ 1120

The fact is, people say, "The Democrats are at fault," "The Republicans are at fault." If we look honestly at the spending appetites of Republicans and Democrats, we will not see a plugged nickel's worth of difference. There is a difference in what they want to spend money on, but there is no difference in the amount of money they want to spend. They can talk until they are blue in the face and they cannot get rid of the facts. The facts are that the Republicans want to spend as much as the Democrats.

They all want to spend too much. This side wants to spend it on defense, and this side wants to spend it on domestic programs, but the fact is it is clear over the last 10 years both sides want to spend more money than we have, so it is not either side pointing fingers and one is a big spender and the other is not. It is simply not the case.

In fact, this document from a Republican President demonstrates that there is a Republican, at least, that says, "I want my colleagues to join me in adding \$2 trillion to the Federal debt." So it is a bipartisan failure, obviously a failure in leadership coming from the White House and obviously, quite obviously, a failure here in Congress to do anything about what I think is dangerous leadership and reckless leadership in fiscal policy.

What should we do? This is a country of instant coffee, fast food, Jiffy Lube, instant credit, and everybody believes "what we have to do now is have an instant fix." The President said:

Let us just hook up the battery cables here with some incentives here and some jolts here in the Tax Code, and this and that and the other thing, and the American engine will start and get cranking away and we will be just fine again.

However, we are not going to be just fine again. If we move in this way with this budget document, we are confining ourselves to the status of economic losers for a long, long time, and we cannot do that. Nor can we expect an instant fix to terrible problems.

As I have said, we have had irresponsible public policies and fiscal policies coming from the White House, and in Congress we have had equally irresponsible policies.

PRIVATE GREED

There has been equally irresponsible behavior in the private sector. Look at the 1980's. Forty years from now we will read in the history books about the greed and corruption and the unprecedented greed in the 1980's: junk bonds, hostile takeovers, leveraged buyouts, failure, and collapse in the private sector. The crowning glory here, or the crowning shame, is that the U.S. Government ended up owning junk bonds in the Taj Mahal casino.

That is right. Mr. Trump built the Taj Mahal, the biggest, glitziest casino in America, perhaps in the world. He fi-

nanced it with junk bonds. The junk bonds were bought by S&L's. The S&L's went broke, and the Federal Government ended up with the junk bonds in the Taj Mahal casino. The junk bonds themselves are nonperforming because the Taj Mahal was not doing well. So you have a triple failure here, and who ends up with it? The American taxpayer. So the private sector has not done very well either.

In Japan and Germany and France they are busy building better products, busy building better toasters, tires, television sets, and VCR's. What are we doing? Doubling our defense budget in a cold war. Our scientists and engineers are building F-16's and M-1 tanks to compete against the scientists and engineers of Japan, who are building television sets and Toyotas. And who wins the economic competition? They do, not us.

More than that, to the extent that we have got scientists and engineers in the private sector, the companies that employ them are engaged in greed games, economically cannibalizing each other, a cannibalization of the assets in the private sector, trying to buy and sell each other, not make better products. They spent their days in the eighties trying to figure out how you take over another company or how do you avoid being taken over, instead of learning how to build a better product and sell it at a better price.

The economic hangover that results from a decade of greed and corruption in the private sector, and a decade of incompetence in the public sector, is what we now deal with as Americans.

PUTTING AMERICA BACK ON TRACK

What do we do to put this country back on track? Is it a series of tax breaks? Is it a new American jobs program?

Next Wednesday morning those of us who serve on the Committee on Ways and Means start writing an economic growth package. The President, on the microphone behind me a couple of weeks ago, outlined his blueprint and his version for where we ought to go in economic growth. The fact is, to put this country back on track is going to require much, much more.

I do not object to some of the recommendations made by the President. I intend to support some of them. Some of them are fine. But the issue is not some sort of short-term jump start. The terminology itself suggests that what is wrong is, "The engine has sputtered, and we just need to hook up the cables and the engine will begin purring again and America will move down this yellow brick road and everything will be just fine." That is not at all the case.

We have structural, fundamental problems that go well beyond the short term, that are going to require a national commitment by the American

people to confront them. Do we have a national will to do that? Is there national leadership to call the American to do that? Will Congress have the courage to follow good leadership if it develops? I do not know the answer to that, but I know at least from my perspective what we ought to do.

I put together a pamphlet a couple of months ago. It says, "Putting America back on track: A plan to help the economy grow again," in which I just tried to set out what I thought we had to do. Let me just run down some of the areas that I think we have to address.

First, and I have talked about it now for a short period, the country has to pay its bills. It is a virtue we learn when we are in kindergarten. We have got to pay our bills. A country that has \$3.6 trillion in borrowing and is proposing that we add \$1 billion a day in borrowing for the next 6 years is not a country that can survive economically and prosper. We have got to pay our bills, as tough as that may sound, one way or another.

The American people and Congress and the President have to decide what they want, answer the questions: Do we need it, can we afford it, and if the answers to both are yes, then let us do it. If the answer to one of them is no, then let us decide that we cannot continue in these areas.

We must make a decision: What do we want, what do we need, and what are we willing and prepared to pay for. If we do not reconcile our appetite for spending with our ability and our responsibility to raise the revenue to meet it, then we cannot put this country back on a sound economic footing for the long term. So first we have to pay our bills.

Second, we have got to put a stop to this fever of greed in this country and this enormous mountain of speculation. Hostile takeovers, junk bonds, leveraged buyouts, that sort of thing, it ought not to go on.

One cannot engage in a hostile takeover in Japan. Do you know why? The Japanese will not allow it. Do you know why they will not allow it? Because they know it is nonproductive and injures the economy. They want their private sector to be paying attention to building better products, not involved in playing these little private greed games. We ought to flat out put a stop to that sort of economic activity.

Third, we ought to stop paying everybody else's defense bills. One way to reduce the deficit is to say to Japan and West Germany and others, "Pay us for the amount of money we spend to keep the sea lanes open so you can ship your Toyotas to Pittsburgh. We cannot continue to ask the American taxpayer to pay everybody else's defense bills in the world. This country cannot afford it."

President Bush and Congress need to join, as we have done in an amendment

that I offered last year that is now a law, in saying to other countries, "We are happy to have the aircraft carriers out there to keep the sea lanes open, but you have a responsibility to help pay for the cost of the captains and the crews and the aircraft carriers. We expect you to make a yearly offset payment to this country to begin relieving the taxpayers of this country of the burden to help pay for the entire free world's defense umbrella."

The next step is to insist on fair trade. We cannot win an international trading competition unless the rules are fair. The fact is, we have a lot of people in this town, starting at the White House, and a good many in this Chamber, including some of my party, who are perfectly willing to continue to chant "free trade" and ignore the fundamental issue of fair trade. Trade is not and will not ever be free unless it is fair. To somehow blame America first by suggesting we make inferior products when other markets are closed to us denies the fact that we could not sell if we had the best products in the history of humankind, when we confront a market that is not open.

It is unacceptable to allow other countries to tell us that they want to ship their goods to American consumers in the American marketplace and compete with our goods, but then when we try and sell beef or rice or cars or insurance policies or construction contracts anywhere around the world, we find them saying, "Our market is closed to you."

□ 1130

One of our trading partners shipped half a million cars to this country, and at the same time they went from zero to a half-million imports of those country's cars into the United States, they shut off the entire import of red meat from the United States to that country. And what do we do about it? Nothing. Because nobody has the nerve.

The minute you stand up and talk about this, we have got a bunch of people wearing bow ties whose collars are too tight and who apparently cannot think clearly who say, "These are protectionists; these are protectionists. What they want to do is close our markets in America." That is not so. I do not want to close American markets. I want American markets to be open. I want the American consumer to have access to any product around the world they want to be able to purchase. All I insist is that our employees and our employers that are producing American goods have the same opportunity in other markets, and if they do not, then there is something fundamentally wrong with our trade policy.

If we say, "Yes, ship your cars here, ship your television sets here, we will continue to be a sponge for all of your products, and we accept that you will not open your markets to Americans,"

then we are about half goofy. That is not a public policy that is acceptable, and it is not a public policy that will allow our concerns, our employees, and our American companies that produce some pretty good products to compete around the rest of the world on a fair basis.

Now, look, I understand that the Japanese make some awfully good products, and I tip my hat to some of them. The fact is that in some areas they have got a significant edge. So a tip of the hat to the Japanese productivity and the Japanese quality.

But the fact is in areas where we have got an edge, we cannot sell in Japan, because the market is closed. I just believe it is time for us to stand up and insist on fair trade, no, not closing our markets, just insist that other countries open theirs. If we do not have fair trade, we cannot compete effectively internationally, and if we cannot compete effectively, then we cannot win.

Now, in concert with that, the other thing we need to do, in my judgment, is develop a national commitment and a national program in which the private sector and the public sector join hands in pursuit of excellence in producing the best products around the world. I want next year, or 5 years or 10 years from now, when somebody around the world looks on the shelf and wants to buy a product and they turn it over and see the label and it says, "Made in the U.S.A.," I want that consumer to say, "I know what this means. This means this is the finest product I can buy." When "Made in the U.S.A." once again is a symbol of value and quality, then we win. But only then if open markets represent opportunities for us to sell around the world.

We need a national commitment to produce the finest products in the world. This country can do it. This country has done it, and this country should do it again.

And I think that Congress and the private sector ought to join together in a national program to try to create a commitment for product quality. The foundation of all progress, in my judgment, is an education system. If we do not have the finest education system, then we do not win either.

I want to tell a story that I have told many times here on the floor, but it is worth telling again. The oldest Member of Congress when I came to Congress was a man named Claude Pepper, a wonderful man. He was here when Franklin Delano Roosevelt was here, in his first term, and he was still here when I came to Congress 11 years ago. When I walked into his office the first time, I saw two pictures behind his desk. He had a room full of memorabilia and pictures. Two that I recalled behind his chair were both autographed to him. One was Orville Wright making his first airplane flight, Orville and

Wilbur flying at Kitty Hawk, and it was autographed to Congressman Claude Pepper "with deep admiration," signed, "Orville Wright." And the other was Neil Armstrong standing on the Moon, autographed to Claude Pepper. It struck me that here is a Member of Congress who has the autographed pictures to himself, of the first person to fly and the first person to set foot on the Moon.

You know, from lifting off the first time to flying to the Moon, what does that burst of technology and progress in a relatively short period mean? As I looked at those pictures, it occurred to me what it means is the massive commitment that America had made to education. It represented a burst of knowledge and, therefore, a burst of productivity, and in lots of areas, but measured in a most interesting way by flying and then flying to the Moon. It is measured in other ways from the quill pen to the computer, but those two pictures, let me once again understand, the foundation of this country's progress is education.

I worry a lot, you know, our kids go to school 180 days a year. The Japanese kids go to school 240 days a year. Yesterday, driving down the road, on the care radio I heard once again that in math and science skills our students rank behind 90 percent of the other industrialized countries. I worry about that.

This country, in order to get back on track, has to decide that it will have and maintain the finest educational system in the world, and then find a way to run it and operate it in a way that makes it workable for those in it, especially the students.

Here in Washington, DC, the shame is that the school board was recently debating about whether they should have metal detectors at the front door of a school to try to extract from students coming in knives and guns as they entered the schoolroom door for the start of the day. How can children learn and study and grow, how can their minds be nurtured and honed in a school where they wonder if the kid next to them has a gun or a knife?

Well, we have got plenty of challenges in those areas, but my point is that somehow we need to put the system back together at the foundation.

I want to mention crime just for a minute, because it also is part of this dimension. This country has become a manufacturer of crime.

About 2 miles from where I am standing is a hospital called D.C. General Hospital, and I went down to D.C. General here a while back and toured. I heard some statistics that were remarkable to me, very depressing, but remarkable.

Nearly one-third of the women delivering babies at D.C. General Hospital were drug abusers. I went into a room where they had what are called boarder

babies. These are babies who are delivered to a woman who comes to the hospital, delivers the baby, there is no husband, no father, the woman delivers the baby, perhaps a drug abuser, and she walks out of the hospital, and there is the baby, no mother, no father, no home, no name, no hope, no future, a room full of children. I held a 4-month-old baby in my arms that had no name, because it had no parents.

The doctor, a remarkable woman, a black woman who had lived in a neighborhood very close to that hospital when she was young, told me that she grew up in that neighborhood and did not have much, but she had a family, and that family lived in a place, and they had neighbors, and they knew each other, and it was a neighborhood. She said she went back, this doctor from D.C. General, went back to the neighborhood where she lived, and there are not any families there any more. There are children and some grandparents and a scattered mom or dad somewhere, but there is no functional family unit. They do not know their neighbors. There are no neighbors that know each other and help each other and work with each other, and try to deal with each other's problems. The entire structure is gone.

This doctor at D.C. General said:

You know, I do not know how you fix this until you fix it at the bottom, somehow deal with that structure, the family structure, the neighborhood structure.

And, you know, this country has got to deal with those problems as well.

Why is it that a country like ours, a country that is urbane, relatively wealthy in assets, sophisticated, our country consumes 50 percent of the world's cocaine? Why? Why would that happen in a country like ours? I do not know the answer to that. I do not know the answer to this enormous burst of crime, violent crime, in our country either.

But we must find innovative ways to deal with it. Part of it is economic. Part of it is putting this country back on track so that people who want jobs can have jobs, but that is not all of it.

To the extent that we can, we need, however, to move forward and provide those opportunities, those jobs.

I went to a feeding center, a shelter, here in Washington, DC, one day at 6 in the morning, and I recall speaking to a 24-year-old woman with three children, husband had abandoned her, and she had no money. She had no home. She lived in a shelter, and she told me, when I asked her what she was doing to try to find work, she said:

Well, I do find work, but, you know, it is short-term, usually at a hamburger place. I get paid minimum wage. I have no place to put my children, because then if I am not taking care of them, I have to pay day care. You cannot pay day care on \$4.35 an hour.

Then I lose Medicaid benefits. I lose health care when I go to work. When I go to work and I try to save \$25 or \$50 so I can get a de-

posit saved up for an apartment, they tell me that if I save money for a deposit on an apartment, then they reduce the AFDC payments.

She said:

There isn't any way that I can get ahead. There is no way I can find a place to live. There is no way that I can get training to get a job.

□ 1140

Driving back to Capitol Hill that morning after visiting with that woman, I was wondering what I would do if I were in her position. Is she trapped on one of those circles that she cannot get off? I do not know honestly what I could do to get off. I do not know that I could do anything differently than she is doing.

She looks for work. She finds a little work. She loses money on AFDC. She cannot afford daycare. She loses her health care benefits. I think she is trapped.

Somehow, some way all of us need to deal with a system that is not working, responding to the needs of the people like her.

We will this year deal with another element or part of what is wrong in this country and that is health care. Health care costs too much. There is a lot of sophisticated proposals. The President announced one yesterday in Cleveland to try to respond to the health care crisis.

No proposal will work unless it first responds to the issue of health care costs too much. What do we do to respond to it? How do we impose caps, price caps, price controls in a way that is effective?

If we cannot do that, if we will not do that, if we do not do that, we cannot answer the question of how to make health care affordable for all Americans.

Senator WOFFORD spent a couple of months walking around Pennsylvania asking the question, should not a country where when one is charged with a crime one has the right to see a lawyer, should not then one be able in a country like that when you are sick be able to see a doctor? The answer is, of course, of course, health care ought to be a right.

The question is, How do we make sure everyone is covered and how do we do that in a manner that is affordable? How do we do it so that those who can afford to pay for their own health insurance do it and do not face 25 and 40 percent insurance premium increases in a year, and those who cannot afford to pay for their insurance are covered by some bare-bones plan that solved their health care problem, and is administered somehow within the confines of a Medicare system or some other delivery system? How do we do all that?

Well, the President and Congress must get their arms around it. It deals not just with the tragedy of the lack of

health care for a lot of people. It is especially that, but it also deals with competitiveness. We have more health care costs in an American car than steel. In other words, it costs more for health care to build a car than it does steel because we have health care benefits paid to the workers who are building the car.

Because we pay much more health care than the Japanese, it means that our cars are less competitive with Japanese from a price standpoint because our health care costs more than the Japanese health care system. So it makes us noncompetitive.

It is not just in cars. It is in a wide range of manufactured goods. Health care costs are injuring our competitiveness.

Let me mention agriculture briefly. We have a system in this country that tries to respond to the needs of family farming, and it does not work. Family farmers are going broke in record numbers. And although farm prices have increased in recent months, we have seen a price collapse for a long period of time that has forced thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of farmers off the farm.

We are told by economists and people who think they know that somehow the productive capability of American agriculture is a liability. It is not a liability. It is an enormous asset.

Most of the serious trouble in the world is people who do not have anything to eat. I am chairman of the International Task Force of the Hunger Committee. I can tell my colleagues that I have been in refugee camps in various parts of the world. I have seen a lot of hungry people. There is nothing that represents a greater asset to the country or a society than the ability to produce the kind of food-stuffs we do.

What do the Russians and the people in the Commonwealth need? Food. What do the people in Africa need? Food. We were so successful at sending guns and arms and bombs all around the world to people that needed it and to governments that wanted it. Why can we not be just as successful for much less the cost and at a much greater humanitarian gesture in sending some food to people who are hungry? It ought to be a matter of national will for us to decide we are going to start doing the right thing.

I am mentioning that, we are talking about defense spending these days. The President and others say, we will cut \$50 billion out of defense. The cold war is over. It is certainly welcome that we would cut a little out of defense, but \$50 billion over 5 years is a small cut in defense; \$50 billion over 5 years is somewhere around a 3-percent cut in defense spending.

We doubled defense spending because we had a cold war. Why would we not cut more than 3 percent out of defense spending when the cold war is over?

All of these things, it seems to me, come together in a set of public policy questions that we had better be ready to respond to and answer. The issue is not our next election. The issue is not George Bush's reelection, and the issue is not the reelection of any single Member in this Congress. The issue is this country's ability to compete and prosper and provide jobs and opportunities for its citizens for the next decade and the decades beyond.

If we make the wrong choices now, and I fear that we are on the road to doing that, certainly with this budget submission by the President, if we make the wrong choices now, we cannot soon recover from those choices.

The question is, do we have the courage, the will to decide to start doing what is right? I think the answer is yes, but we will see.

This, I think, is a very pivotal year. We have the opportunity, as my friend the late Claude Pepper used to say before he died, he said:

An election year is an opportunity for the American people to grab America's steering wheel and decide with their vote which direction they turn this country.

I really feel that the American people deep in their gut all over this country understand the gnawing fear that comes from spending money one does not have on things one does not need and see all the things around one not working as well as they should, and then seeing all the folks who are supposed to see that they work off arguing and debating about other extraneous matters and never quite getting to the center or the core of the issue.

So let us heed their words and work hard to put America back on track.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I really want to commend the gentleman for not only having presented an enormously cogent and intelligent argument but also in having done something which I think is very important for the public at large to understand, and that is to point out the fallacies in the use of old invalid—proven by the test of the last 23 years—theories that the budget contains for the purpose of guiding the economic future of this country.

I am glad the gentleman brought up the name of Claude Pepper because in addition to talking about guiding the steering wheel of America in the election year, our colleague, Claude, used to say something else. And he said it more eloquently than ever in the same well, in the same spot that the gentleman from North Dakota is standing, just a few years ago, months before his death, when talking about catastrophic health care, as the gentleman will remember.

He said, talking to the colleagues in this Chamber:

When you go home tonight and you close your eyes, you have to think to yourself, did I do something good for somebody today? Did I make somebody's life a little easier? Did I ease the burden on somebody? If you can say, yes, then you have done your job as a Member of Congress.

That budget can never allow George Bush to answer that question yes. What he is doing here is heaping more misery upon the broad, vast middle class and many other people in this country than has already been heaped upon them.

The gentleman's description of how this is a prescription for failure for the future economic well-being of this country was very apt. What I fail to understand is where are all the economists and all of the smart carping newspaper people who are constantly after the Congress to somehow do what the President is supposed to and that is set an economic footprint and path for this country? Where are they today, saying 3 years ago:

"Mr. President, you promised a balanced budget as did your predecessor 8 years before you. Not only have you not balanced the budget, every budget you send up has been out of balance and this year at a time of great moral crisis around the world, great economic crisis around the world, and a lack of leadership around the world, and at times of great economic crisis in the United States, you have proposed a budget with over \$400 billion in deficit, admitting that you want to spend more than we can take in. And your answer is to cut domestic programs in order to finance only a small part of that proposed deficit, but the rest of it is to be borrowed."

□ 1150

Why are people standing up and saying why are you fabricating stories about how this country can be healthy when we know for the last 11 years we have borrowed, and borrowed, and borrowed to finance the defense buildup? I am sure the gentleman in the well would not disagree that the single biggest drain on the economy for the last 11 years in terms of the deficit has been the enormous defense spending we have made. Why are people not asking him how in the face of that 11 years where we have now arrived at after the Reagan-Bush era to the place where we are now economically in bad shape, why are people not asking the question:

"Why are you continuing to use discredited, old Reaganomics? Why did you stand there and tell us you want health care for people and then not tell us that you wanted to cut Medicare \$15 billion so that you wanted the elderly to have their health care cut so you could provide health care for the others through tax credits, but only drive the price up because after they cut Medicare what is going to happen?"

As the gentleman in the well knows, they are going to charge more to those

people that have insurance. That drives the premiums up so that those who cannot afford the premiums now will even be less able to afford them later.

"Why don't you give us straight, simple answers to straight, simple questions?" And on the needs of this country, "Why do you publish a budget like that? Why do you tell everybody you hate the deficit and then build out as far as the eye can see," as the gentleman indicated, 2 trillion dollars' worth of debt? "Why are you doing this to us? Why are you not accountable?"

Where are the people asking those questions, I ask the gentleman, because I do not understand. The gentleman said the other day if you laid all of the economists end to end, it would be a good thing. Somebody else said if you laid them all end to end you would never reach a conclusion.

I am tired of listening to the economists, and we could get economists to tell us that is a great budget. We ought to listen to the American people, and the gentleman understands that very well and has talked plain, simple American language to the folks around this country who are hopefully listening. And I hope that the President is listening, because he is the one. I disagree to some degree with the gentleman who said that we are all to blame. The Congress has had its share, yes, I agree. But the gentleman will admit, I believe that we do not really make the economic, philosophical decisions in this Chamber. They are made in the White House. The path is set by the White House. We played on the margins trying to reduce the impact. We told people, and the gentleman knows this. He is on the Ways and Means Committee. He has worked very hard to turn around some of the policies the President wanted.

Why are we going back to them? Why are we going to use more failed policies? The gentleman has laid out a clear, concise message that it is wrong, and I want to commend the gentleman for having done so. And hopefully American anger will increase a little bit in this election year and make more accountability go to the President and others who have promised that this economy would be wonderful, that we were headed in the right direction, that we had enough money to do everything, to build bombs, and to send kids to school, to give them loans, to help the elderly.

The gentleman knows now we are to the breaking point. The biggest single part of the budget that is going to be nondiscretionary soon, beside the entitlements, is going to be the interest payment on that debt. And certainly the gentleman's description of what is being done in the Social Security trust fund by accounting, and I did not hear the gentleman say, but I believe that the gentleman will indicate when he takes back his time, I believe that is il-

legal, is it not? I believe under the law we cannot use the balance, the surplus in the Social Security trust fund to reduce the deficit.

So the gentleman has told people what is happening. I would hope that people begin to listen and make the President accountable and hold us accountable too. The gentleman is right. We have an obligation.

There was a guest minister here the other day who said, with the glory of becoming a Congressman comes a commensurate obligation. And we have an obligation to the American people. I believe the Democrats are going to meet that obligation in fairness in the Tax Code to middle-class Americans, in the provisioning of health care, and in the provisioning of jobs, and a growth package that will reduce the deficit and put Americans to work, and in the provisioning of a trade policy. That is where we are going this year, a fair trade policy. That, as the gentleman indicates, says to people around the world our markets are open to you, but if you do not open your markets to us, then we are going to have to revisit how you can trade with us and not let us trade with you. That is not protectionism. That is the way fairness has always been in the minds of most Americans.

So I hope that the gentleman's message is heard beyond this Chamber. I hope the gentleman's message is being carried forward by a lot of people in this country and they begin to think about how much further we can go with these failed policies, which are reimplemented and renewed in this President's budget before this country is brought to its knees economically. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments the gentleman has made. As he knows, I walk a narrow board here across this chasm politically because I understand that the people I represent and the people all around this country, the last thing they want to see when they are unemployed and wondering about the future, and have an ache in their gut because they are worried about losing their jobs, they are worried about their families, the last thing they want to see is a bunch of us carping at each other and saying who is at fault and who is to blame. They want answers, and they want jobs, an America that works for the future, and they count on us really and want us to do something and do something constructive for the country.

The gentleman may have heard me in a Democratic caucus the other day stand up and say, "You know, I am flat out sick of listening to economists and pollsters." I don't care what economists and pollsters say anymore, and I do not give a rip what the press says about economists and pollsters.

The people who play pinocchio in my hometown of 300 people, the retired

folks, know exactly what is wrong with this country. They know that a country that spends \$1 billion a day of money that it does not have, often on things it does not need, is going to be in deep, deep trouble. They know that a country that says to its largest businesses, go ahead and have war with each other, just spend a decade trying to buy and sell each other and pasting America with phony financial paper, go ahead and do that, they know that a country that allows that sort of baloney is going to weaken itself internally.

The folks who play pinocchio back home know all of that. They know it, and they want to see the Government do something about it.

Why does somebody want to run for President just to be President? I have asked that question of myself: Why run for Congress unless you are able to get something done? And there are days I despair about that, because I care very much about getting something done here. And it is awfully difficult to see in the face of a proposal by the President to add \$2 trillion in new debt that we are doing anything that is instrumental or constructive for this country, but instead all of us are going to do something terribly destructive to our future.

It seems to me that the only chance we have to change all of this is to decide there has to be an economic revolution of sorts in which all of us decide we are just not going to put up with any of this.

I am almost tempted to say at least this vote will not vote for anything this year, nothing, zero, until somebody sits down and comes up with a plan that is relatively sane and steers us back away from the cliff. That is not a very constructive thing to be thinking about. But how else do we stop this place in its tracks?

If a train is heading in the wrong direction toward a cliff and going 100 miles an hour, the first thing we have to do is to get it stopped. And then we start thinking about how to turn it around.

We need an economic renaissance of sorts. A part of that is the sort of thing you and I know in our hearts is right, and that is investing in people. This country has enormous human potential.

When I hear people say that the American people are lazy, and slothful, and indolent, and do not do good work, I really despair about that, because I can tell you something. I have met with a lot of folks who are disadvantaged, and down and out and in trouble. Two-thirds of welfare in this country is paid to kids under 16. So I guess the folks that want to criticize, they can go ahead and criticize kids. But I guess I would like to take care of kids.

□ 1200

I have talked to a lot of other people on welfare. Yes, some of them have in-

stitutionalized it and they have abused it, and I happen to be one of those who think we ought not pay welfare to able-bodied people unless they are doing something for it. I believe that.

But I tell you something else. I have not met a welfare person, not one—I am sure they exist, but I have not met them—who would not much prefer a decent job to take care of themselves and their families. They want work.

I have toured plants and factories, and I will tell you something. The American people are people who with the right kind of leadership can do enormously interesting and wonderful things. Gosh, we have gone to the Moon. We have done all these things.

The technology in the Persian Gulf war was breathtaking. America would sit and watch these things, bombs going down ventilator shafts, and gasp at the sheer remarkable technical quality of what American scientists and engineers have done to help defend us.

Why cannot a country that does that sort of remarkable achievement in technology and defense, why cannot a country like that not do the same remarkable things in building an industrial base that provides growth, jobs, and opportunity? Why can it not do the same innovative things in social structure to deal with this crime problem, its welfare problem and other things? I think it can. It is just a matter of deciding what is the most important asset we have in America—the human asset, the American people, the American worker.

So you educate and you train and you motivate, you employ and you produce jobs. That is what you do to put the country back on track.

We have been through a period in which somehow if you have not been selfish, if your motive is not to be selfish for myself, make as much money as you can in as short a time as possible any way you can make it, if that was not your motive, then somehow you were not successful. No notion of shared responsibility, no notion of some combined national commitment that was necessary, and so we started coming apart, falling apart.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman knows where that kind of philosophy emanates.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. That is the problem. The gentleman mentioned 1 minute ago the word, the single key word, "leadership," the direction, but to provide the leadership to move us in that direction, this is what it is all about.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. No question about it.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. It is not happening here. In the eighties the leadership did not exist. They let everybody

else lead, and where did it lead? Over the cliff.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Let me give you a small example of that. I watched all this going on in the private sector with junk bonds, hostile takeovers; gosh, I have been on the floor with amendment after amendment to try to shut it down.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I voted for all those amendments, too.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. And finally, I offered an amendment that says we will not allow S&L's to buy any more junk bonds. We shut down that business. The shenanigans that were going on with the people who are now doing 2 years at hard tennis at all these minimum security prisons, you know, that were flying all this paper around America. We shut it down, and the junk bond market collapsed.

You know why we had to do that? Regulators should have done that 6 years before, but regulators did not regulate. Do you know why? They collected their pay checks and they were appointed to office as regulators, but they did not regulate because Ronald Reagan said that government is evil, government is bad, government is the problem, so we are going to put people in office who are called regulators and we do not want you to regulate. You look the other way and let these folks steal you blind.

The result was this carnage, this economic casino that was built in the private sector in which all these companies and individuals started floating all these assets around with junk bonds. They were not producing a bit of new wealth for America. They were destroying companies that had been around a hundred years. And why? Because regulators did not regulate.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Most of the junk bonds and leveraged buyouts that occurred moved money only between people at the top level, incurred greater debt for the companies and most of those leveraged buyouts actually resulted in jobs being lost at the very time the deal was consummated, let alone later on when some of those people went into bankruptcies, big bankruptcies, including the Macy's bankruptcy now, the other problems, the Federated, all these big retail stores; but people lost their jobs then, and now they are going to lose their jobs, what is left of the jobs, because these companies are going out of business, and not a dime was shared with the people on the bottom.

What people in this country think is that people invest in the stock market, that they are investing in those companies. The gentleman and I know they are not. When you buy stock in the

stock market, you are making a bet. You are betting the stock goes up. The money that you spend for the stock goes to the former owner. It does not go to General Motors or to Pratt & Whitney or to the little small startup technology companies. That money goes to the people who own the stock.

There is no investment on the stock market that is going to make America grow. The investment you need to make is starting new companies and providing new jobs for people. That did not occur in the 1980's, either. There was no approach that was done that way, and the gentleman has pointed that out.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Well, Mr. Speaker, our time is about up. I did just want to say, I wanted to come down and talk about this 10-pound book that says let us spend \$2.2 trillion that we do not have in the next 6 years, a billion dollars a day for 6 years.

I have a little son who is in school this morning. The President seems to be saying that this is his future.

Well, I only have one vote here, but in my judgment, it is not my future, it is not my son's future. This is a future of despair and of economic decline for this country. We must fight for change. We have got to have an economic revolution of sorts in which we stop this train that is headed in the wrong direction, turn it around and move it back to the virtues all of us learned, the book that Fulghum wrote, "All I Really Need to Know I Learned in Kindergarten."

We know all we really need to know from those basic lessons. You have got to save. You cannot spend what you do not have. You have to save money. You have to pay your bills.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, we encouraged that in the 1980's, spend and spend.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Exactly, that is right. We went through a decade of unprecedented greed.

But my point is that the answers are found not in some new economic theory, some new paradigm, that is all a lot of nonsense. The answers ought to go back to fundamentals. They taught it in my school. I graduated in a high school class of 9 in a town of 300 people. You got to pay your bills. You do not find that out in calculus. You find it in arithmetic, what your bill is and you got to pay it. It is very simple.

If this country gets back to fundamentals, invests in people, pays its bills, insists on fair treatment and trade, pays attention to education, re-dedicates itself to product quality, decides that it is as great as it can be once again, then this country is going to do fine.

Then my son is going to have a great future. But if we do not change and radically change the policies that we now involved in, we are in very serious

trouble, and at least I do not intend to stay here another day, another month, another hour, unless I am part of a constructive effort to say this has got to stop. We are determined to change it in any way that we can change it, with all the tools at our disposal.

This country must have a chance in its future for growth and opportunity once again, and it is not with this blueprint. It is with the blueprint that says let us invest in the American people. Let us pay our bills. Let us do the things necessary to put America back on track.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman's statement speaks for itself.

I think to some degree what happened this morning is indicative of where we are going. We have been besieged in the last few months, as the gentleman knows, by statements from Japanese officials, high officials who should know better, all the bad things about American workers, they are lazy, they are this, they are that, they are not productive, they worry too much about the weekend and come in on Monday unwilling to work, et cetera.

Well, this morning in response to what has been criticism of that attitude, which I believe reflects their real feelings about everybody else, not just Americans, the Japanese Ministry released a report showing that Americans are most productive, American workers are more productive in many ways than Japanese workers.

Is that not amazing? All of a sudden this report which existed at the Ministry of Trade all of a sudden becomes available to the very people who run that Ministry and people who run the Government, where it says that American workers are more productive.

I think Americans who have a huge capacity for wanting to help others around the world are now understanding that it is time to help ourselves a little bit as well.

When a budget like that can continue to contain upwards of \$130 billion in payments for the defense of other nations by American troops, at the same time that the unemployment rate has reached the highest level in so many years, so many Americans are out of work, so many students are missing the ability to go to college, so many elderly are having to do without, then there is something wrong with the people who make up the document.

Look, if we withdrew our \$30 billion support for Japan tomorrow and let them protect themselves, would the world crumble? Everybody knows it will not any longer.

There is no threat in Europe. We could reduce our spending on NATO support in Europe from \$110 billion to \$130 billion down to \$10 billion or \$20 billion, is the world going to collapse

tomorrow? Everybody knows it will not.

Where is that reflected in that document, the reality of today's world and the responsibility that the White House and the whole Government owes to the American people, which is the basis on which it operates in the first place, because without the American people there would be no way to fund the Government.

□ 1210

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. It is interesting that 2 years ago I was on the floor with an amendment and I pointed out at that time we had 325,000 American troops stationed in Europe but in addition we also hired 200,000 civilian employees.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. That is correct.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. We had 525,000 people in Western Europe on the American payroll, the biggest jobs program in the world. We had people here at home out of work, could not afford to do this, that, or the other thing for people here at home. That does not make any sense.

I am not suggesting we rearm Japan; I am just suggesting Japan pay us each year for the amount of money we spend for their defense. But what the gentleman says and what I have said just now is we get the people wearing bowties downtown who are the great thinkers and some folks who report on this, and they say, "Well, what we have just heard is xenophobic, protectionist, and isolationist," right?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I have heard that, too.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. It is all such a bunch of nonsense.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. That is what they say. But it is wrong.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Right. I am just wondering, when they call us protectionists, they mean it in a pejorative way, suggesting we want to close America's borders. And I do not believe that at all.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. If the gentleman would yield again, I say to the gentleman I do not want to close America's borders either. What has made us great is the ability of the United States to trade.

One of the reasons we went to Europe with the Marshall plan, one of the reasons we went to Japan after the war was not only for the altruistic reason of building their own countries back up but because we wanted to open their markets, to be able to afford the goods that we wanted to ship in to them so that they could buy them and we could put Americans to work.

But after 50 years, almost 50 years since the end of the war, their markets are alive and well, their countries are doing great. Why do we continue to have to pay for their security so they can close their markets to us and then

come and beat us over the head with unfair trade practices?

I do not want to close the markets at all. I just want them to open their markets to the extent that we open our markets to them.

I am tired of hearing—well, I do not know what word you would call them, but these people who are screaming that that is xenophobia, it is Japan-bashing or Europe-bashing or protectionism. It is not at all.

Nobody here is calling for higher tariffs, nobody here is calling for nontariff trade barriers, nobody is calling for anything except fair play.

What happened to the leadership in this country that it cannot stand up, look the Japanese or the Europeans or anyone else in the eye, and say "fair trade"? That is what starts today: Fair trade.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. They have lost their nerve, they do not want to do that. You know, it is interesting, there is a notion somehow that if you stand up and say these things you are protectionist and protecting America is somehow unpatriotic. When did it become unpatriotic to be someone who says, "My interest is to protect America, not with closed markets but by insisting on fair trade rules?" If we are not going to protect America, who is? Japan? Germany? Are you kidding me? The journalists? The columnists? Of course not. America needs protection at least in the form of requiring fair trade rules.

Now let me just mention one other thing. The gentleman from Florida asked, "Where is everybody on these issues?" The \$2.2 trillion debt? I have seen one article since the President spoke about what he is proposing, and that did not have the \$2.2 trillion in it. Where is everybody? Well, they are searching for the giant scandal so they can act like flies around a batch of honey. The fact is—

Mr. SMITH of Florida. The gentleman is being kind calling it honey.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. The fact is we are involved in a period of almost total thoughtlessness in dealing in a public way and also in the press with real debate about real issues: What is the deficit? How do we respond to it? How do we deal with health care in a real way? There is such thoughtlessness at a time when we require and need such thoughtfulness in a national debate about where is this country going and how it is going to get there. My hope is that all of us, and my hope is that especially this year during a Presidential contest and a lot of debates around the country, that we can finally have a responsible, no, not a Willie Horton debate, but a responsible debate about what our hopes and dreams are for the future and what kind of public policies really get us to that kind of future. What do we have to do together? What are our shared responsibilities?

If we can have the public involved in that kind of a public debate, this country will be well served.

This country goes off course from time to time, we veer to the left and veer to the right; but you look at a couple of centuries of history and this country and the common sense of the middle of the American people is what always brings us back to center policies that work.

As Adlai Stevenson said, "Trust the people, trust their good sense, trust their faith and fortitude, and trust them with the important decisions."

I am hopeful that this kind of information debated all around this country this year will put us in a position where we can and will trust the judgment of the American people to lead us to an economic future that this country deserves.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. GOSS) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SANTORUM, for 60 minutes, on February 19.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, for 60 minutes, today and 60 minutes on February 14.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, on February 18 and 19.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 60 minutes, on June 16, 17, and 18.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOSS) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

Mr. WELDON.

Mr. BLILEY.

Mr. IRELAND.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. ZIMMER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. LUKE.

Mr. SKELTON.

Mr. TRAFICANT in two instances.

Mr. WOLPE.

Mr. ALEXANDER.

Mr. PEASE in two instances.

Mr. ASPIN.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. MANTON.

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. PANETTA.

Mr. DERRICK.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY in two instances.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 11, 1992, at noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JACOBS (for himself, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota):

H.R. 4192. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide for truth in budgeting with respect to intragovernmental transactions involving trust funds; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mrs. BENTLEY:

H.R. 4193. A bill to prohibit the President from entering into or carrying out a country-to-country agreement to allow production of the Patriot missile system by another country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mr. FORD of Michigan):

H.R. 4194. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a temporary refundable credit for the purchase of a new domestic passenger vehicle; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 4195. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a limited access highway project in the vicinity of Dothan, AL; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4196. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from carrying out the rural health care initiative; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. IRELAND (for himself and Mr. GUNDERSON):

H.R. 4197. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide additional loan assistance to small business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. LENT, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. HUBBARD, and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER):

H.R. 4198. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Service Code of 1986 to exempt vessels of 100 gross tons or less from the tax on transportation of persons by water; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOLTER:

H.R. 4199. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services to review existing

House of Representatives motor vehicle leases and to require that future leasing be conducted through the General Services Administration; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself and Mr. ARCHER):

H.R. 4200. A bill to create jobs, promote economic growth, and encourage savings, investment, and home ownership; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Government Operations, Education and Labor, the Judiciary, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KOSTMAYER:

H.R. 4201. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of certain real property under the special estate tax valuation provisions for certain farm and other real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOAGLAND (for himself, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. LAROCCH, Mr. ORTON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. KYL, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. PRICE, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mr. DOOLEY):

H.R. 4202. A bill to provide for nationwide banking and branching; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. EARLY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. DONNELLY):

H.R. 4203. A bill to amend the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991 to correct certain inconsistencies between State and Federal unemployment compensation rules and assure that all eligible individuals will receive full unemployment benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas:

H.R. 4204. A bill to recognize the organization known as the Shepherd's Centers of America, Inc., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:

H.R. 4205. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to permit Federal firearms licensees to conduct firearms business at out-of-State gun shows; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MCGRATH, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HORTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KOLTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. TORRES, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEVINE of California, Ms. WATERS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WISE, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 4206. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the estab-

lishment or support by States of registries regarding cancer, to provide for a study regarding the elevated rate of mortality for breast cancer in certain States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. FALLONE):

H.R. 4207. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to repeal a penalty for non-compliance by States with a program requiring the use of safety belts and motorcycle helmets; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. BROWN):

H.R. 4208. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the benefits of certain export subsidies in the case of exports of certain unprocessed timber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SYNAR (for himself, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. MCCURDY):

H.R. 4209. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act conferring jurisdiction on certain courts of the United States to hear and render judgment in connection with certain claims of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma," approved December 23, 1982; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H. Res. 351. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Armed Services in the 2d session of the 102d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROWN:

H. Res. 352. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in the 2d session of the 102d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H. Res. 353. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Agriculture in the 2d session of the 102d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Res. 354. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Energy and Commerce in the 2d session of the 102d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HALL of Ohio:

H. Res. 355. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for ex-

penses of investigations and studies by the Select Committee on Hunger in the 2d session of the 102d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H. Res. 356. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the 2d session of the 102d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself and Mr. STUMP):

H. Res. 357. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Veterans Affairs in the 2d session of the 102d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROE

H. Res. 358. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation in the 2d session of the 102d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SANDERS:

H. Res. 359. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives regarding breast cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. HOAGLAND and Mr. LAROCO.

H.R. 123: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. MARLENEE.

H.R. 875: Ms. WATERS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 1063: Mr. EVANS and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 1277: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1546: Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 1547: Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 1633: Mr. MCCOLLUM and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 1987: Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. BROWN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. LEHMAN of California, and Mr. LUKE.

H.R. 2258: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 2437: Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. ESPY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. IRELAND, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 2452: Ms. SNOWE.

H.R. 2485: Mr. HOAGLAND.

H.R. 2646: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 2778: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2806: Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. WELDON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 2815: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 2867: Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 2872: Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 3130: Mr. MOORHEAD.

H.R. 3211: Mr. FALLONE, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. SANTORUM.

H.R. 3221: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. EWING, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 3360: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 3429: Mr. PEASE, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 3441: Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 3545: Mr. LEHMAN of California.

H.R. 3568: Mr. SYNAR and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 3612: Mr. HORTON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3654: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. MCGRATH, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PAXON, Mr. REED, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 3712: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 3732: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. SKAGGS, and Mr. ROYBAL.

H.R. 3857: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 3953: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MINK, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 3967: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. MCCANDLESS.

H.R. 4051: Mr. WELDON, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 4077: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 4080: Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 4089: Mr. PURSELL, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. FROST, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 4145: Mr. UPTON and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 4155: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 4178: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.J. Res. 19: Mr. GINGRICH.

H.J. Res. 213: Mr. GORDON.

H.J. Res. 237: Mr. JENKINS, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.J. Res. 358: Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MFUME, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. CARDIN.

H. Con. Res. 246: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. CARPER.